

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 22 2007

## REMARKS

The above-identified application is United States application serial number 10/866,385 filed on June 10, 2004. Claims 1-6, 14, and 16 are allowed. Claims 7, 8, 10-13, 17-21, and 23-27 are rejected. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

## Claim Objections

Claim 25 is objected to because the Examiner is uncertain as to what "the particular communication path" corresponds to. In response, Applicant has amended "the particular communication path" to --the particular communication path--. Removal of the objection to Claim 25 is respectfully requested.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, Applicant has corrected the antecedent issues in Claim 26, from which Claim 27 depends. Removal of the rejection of Claims 26 and 27 is respectfully requested.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 17, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jardine *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,018). Claim 17 has been amended to include

"generating a single score representing a sum of connectivity condition scores (CCSs) for the processor units in the at least two candidate groups, wherein the CCS indicates the connectivity condition of one communication path associated with a corresponding processor unit; and  
evaluating the single score for each candidate group of the processor units."

These features are not disclosed or suggested in the prior art. Claims 18-22 depend from Claim 17 and include features that further distinguish them from the prior art. Allowance of Claims 17-22 is respectfully requested.

JAN 22 2007

Claim 23 has been amended to recite means for selecting an arbitrary one of the at least two candidate groups when the candidate groups have the same sum of CCSs". Neither Jardine or Lim disclose or suggest this feature. Claim 23 is distinguishable from the prior art for at least these reasons.

Claims 24-27 depend from Claim 23 and include features that further distinguish them from the cited references. Allowance of Claims 23-27 is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

The application, including claims 1-8, 10-14, and 16-27, is believed to be in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is solicited. Should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at (949) 350-7301.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO, Central Number at (571) 273-8300 on the date shown below:

(Signature)

Joy C. Ngo

(Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate)

January 22, 2007

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

*Mary Jo Bertani*

Mary Jo Bertani  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 42,321